

1 David W. Affeld, State Bar No. 123922  
2 Damion Robinson, State Bar No. 262573  
3 Affeld Grivakes LLP  
4 2049 Century Park East, Ste. 2460  
5 Los Angeles, CA 90067  
Telephone: (310) 979-8700

6  
7  
8 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
9 Michael Zeleny  
10  
11

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

MICHAEL ZELENY,

Plaintiff,

vs.

GAVIN NEWSOM, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. CV 17-7357 RS

Assigned to:  
The Honorable Richard G. Seeborg

**PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND  
MOTION TO ADVANCE HEARING DATE  
AND SHORTEN TIME FOR HEARING  
ON MOTION TO CONTINUE TRIAL AND  
PRETRIAL DATES [Local Rule 6-3]**

Action Filed: December 28, 2017  
Trial Date: November 18, 2019

1                   **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

2                   PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT Plaintiff Michael Zeleny (“Zeleny”) will and hereby does  
 3 move for an order pursuant to Local Rule 6-3 for an order advancing the hearing and shortening time  
 4 to hear his concurrently-filed Motion to Continue Trial and Pretrial Dates (the “Motion to  
 5 Continue”). Zeleny requests that the Court hear the Motion to Continue on July 8, 2019 and require  
 6 that any oppositions be filed by July 5, 2019.

7                   Zeleny makes this motion pursuant to Local Rule 6-3. *See Creative Science Systems, Inc. v.*  
 8 *Forex Markets, LLC*, 2006 WL 3826703, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 27, 2016) (holding that a motion  
 9 under Local Rule 6-3 is appropriate, rather than an *ex parte*, where a party seeks only to shorten  
 10 time). This motion is based on this Notice of Motion and Motion, the attached Memorandum of  
 11 Points and Authorities, the accompanying Motion to Continue, the Declaration of Damion Robinson,  
 12 the records and files herein, and such other matters as the Court may consider.

13                  Counsel for defendants Xavier Becerra (“Becerra”) and New Enterprise Associates, Inc.  
 14 (“NEA”) agree to the relief requested in the Motion to Continue and to shortening time. Counsel for  
 15 defendants the City of Menlo Park and Dave Bertini (collectively, the “City”) is on vacation through  
 16 July 8 and unavailable.

17  
 18                  **I. INTRODUCTION**

19                  The parties are unable to complete discovery on the current schedule, which imposes a  
 20 discovery cutoff of July 19, because the pleadings remain unsettled as to defendant New Enterprise  
 21 Associates, Inc. (“NEA”). NEA has a motion to dismiss under submission, and Zeleny has  
 22 requested leave to amend if that motion is granted. NEA’s participation in this case will dictate both  
 23 the scope and schedule of remaining discovery. Robinson Decl. ¶ 1.

24                  The parties will be substantially prejudiced if they do not have the Court’s guidance quickly  
 25 on the remaining schedule. The discovery cutoff is currently set for July 19. Initial expert  
 26 disclosures are due August 1. All of the remaining pre-trial dates, including dispositive motions and  
 27 expert discovery, are set based on the anticipated close of discovery. *Id.* ¶¶ 3-4.

28                  Without an order shortening time, the Motion to Continue cannot be heard until August 8,

1 2019. This is after the close of discovery and the current expert disclosure deadline. The lack of  
 2 clarity as to discovery is substantially prejudicial. *Id.* ¶¶ 3-4.

3 Zeleny, Becerra, and NEA have agreed to the proposed continuance due to the fact that they  
 4 cannot complete discovery until NEA's status is resolved. The outstanding discovery will have a  
 5 domino effect on the other pretrial dates because it will dictate expert opinions and the points for  
 6 dispositive motions. The parties will be significantly prejudiced if they rush to complete discovery  
 7 and expert disclosures, only to have to repeat that discovery once NEA's status is resolved. *Id.* ¶¶ 6-  
 8 7. Moreover, until the pleadings are settled, it is not feasible to conduct dispositive motion practice.

9

10 **II. EFFORTS TO RESOLVE INFORMALLY**

11 Zeleny has attempted to resolve the issues in the underlying Motion to Continue and to  
 12 stipulate to shorten time. Counsel for all parties other than the City are in agreement (a) that a  
 13 continuance is needed and to the proposed schedule, and (b) that shortened time is appropriate to  
 14 address the issue with the Court as soon as possible. Robinson Decl. ¶ 5 & Ex. 1.

15 Zeleny's counsel has been unable to reach counsel for the City. The City's counsel is  
 16 unavailable through July 8. Zeleny's counsel has attempted to contact his assistant to see if anyone  
 17 else at his firm can address the issues. As yet, counsel has not received a response or return call. *Id.*  
 18 ¶¶ 6-7.

19

20 **III. GOOD CAUSE FOR SHORTENING TIME**

21 Good cause exists to shorten time so that the Motion to Continue can be heard in advance of  
 22 the current discovery cutoff. The parties have been pursuing this case diligently, but the status of  
 23 the pleadings remains uncertain. The parties are also in agreement it would be imprudent to attempt  
 24 to complete discovery and expert disclosures until the case is at issue.

25 There have been no previous continuances of trial. Given that NEA's status remains  
 26 uncertain at this time, counsel have agreed that a further continuance is needed.

27 This situation arose only recently. NEA's motion to dismiss was heard on June 13 and  
 28 remains under submission at this time. All parties agree that they cannot complete discovery until it

1 is clear whether NEA is going to remain in this case.

2 While the parties have been able to work cooperatively with the City in scheduling, due to  
3 counsel's vacation, they have been unable to reach a global stipulation. Due to the impending  
4 discovery cutoff and initial expert disclosure deadline, it is not possible to seek the Court's guidance  
5 through a noticed motion. The parties will be prejudiced if they do not receive the Court's guidance  
6 as soon as possible.

7 Dated: June 28, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

8 s/ Damion Robinson  
9 David W. Affeld  
Damion D. D. Robinson  
10 Affeld Grivakes LLP

11 Attorneys for plaintiff Michael Zeleny

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on June 28, 2019, I electronically filed the foregoing document using the Court's CM/ECF system. I am informed and believe that the CM/ECF system will send a notice of electronic filing to the interested parties.

s/ Damion Robinson  
Damion Robinson